SMART & BIGGAR
Intellectual Property & Technology Law

P.O. Box 2999, Station D
900 – 55 Metcalfe Street
Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1P 5Y6
Tel. (613) 232-2486 Fax (613) 232-8440
www.smart-biggar.ca

Allan Brett
abrett@smart-biggar.ca

Our Ref: 77682-240

August 25, 2004

Mr. Alexander O. Boakye
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
U.S.A.

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Examiner Boakye:

Re: Canadian Patent Application
No. 09/584,539
Applicant: CARL F. CAO
Inventor: Carl F. Cao
TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL HANDOFF

Topics for Discussion During Interview

The Examiner has argued on page 2 of the Office Action that Gupta teaches "the wireless network notifying the transmitting host when the wireless receiving host is in handoff and when the wireless receiving host is not in handoff (page 187, second column, paragraph 3)".

This is how Gupta works: the mobile host sends multiple copies of negative acknowledgement (see column 186, paragraph 4). The purpose is to denote handoff completion, but there is no similar mechanism for indicating the start of a handoff.

The base station receives the duplicate acknowledgements. The duplicate acknowledgements trick the base station into sending an acknowledgement on to the TCP sender with the advertised window field set to zero. See column 186 under "B.2 Operation". This tricks the TCP sender into entering "persist mode" such that all states are frozen. The TCP sender leaves persist mode upon receipt of another acknowledgement having a new "latest advertised window". See the third paragraph of column 187.

None of this messaging informs the TCP sender that the wireless receiving host is in handoff or that the wireless receiving host is no longer in handoff as recited in Applicant's claim 1. In fact, column 186 of Gupta specifically states that "we propose to make the TCP sender unaware of the occurrence of the motion by freezing all its transmission timer and states. To do this, the BS is made to change the information in the TCP acknowledgements to make the sender interpret the event as a receivers buffer depletion".

On the basis of this, I would like to discuss with you and more particularly to receive a clear indication from you, of where in Gupta the particular step of "the wireless network notifying the transmitting host when the wireless receiving host is in handoff and when the wireless receiving host is no longer in handoff' is taught in Gupta as required for a proper 102 (e) rejection.

Yours very truly,

SMART & BIGGAR

Allan Brett

RAB:rld
Encl.

SMART & BIGGAR
Intellectual Property & Technology Law

P.O. Box 2999, Station D
55 Metcalfe Street, Suite 900
Ottawa, Canada K1P 5Y6

Tel.: (613) 232-2486
Fax: (613) 232-8440

To Fax no.: (703) 872-9306

Page 1 of: 3

Attention: Examiner Alexander Boakye

From: Allan Brett

Your file no.: 09/584,539

Reply to Ottawa file no.: 77682-240

Date: August 25, 2004

Time: --

If there are any transmission problems, please call (613) 232-2486.

Original copy and any enclosures ☐ will ☒ will not be sent by ☒ mail ☒ courier